



**Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* (Heteroptera):  
*Anthocoridae*) for apple and pear.**

Sigsgaard, L

*Published in:*  
*Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*

*Publication date:*  
2004

*Document version*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Sigsgaard, L. (2004). Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* (Heteroptera):  
*Anthocoridae*) for apple and pear. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, 111, 215-223.

**Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* (Heteroptera: Anthocoridae) for apple and pear.**

Lene Sigsgaard, Department of Ecology, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Thorvaldsensvej 40, DK-1871 Frederiksberg C, tel: +45 3528 2674, FAX: +45 35282670, e-mail: [les@kvl.dk](mailto:les@kvl.dk).

*Key words: Anthocoris nemorum, Anthocoris nemoralis, choice, preference, apple, pear, Malus domestica, Pyrus communis, Operophtera brumata,*

**Abstract**

Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *Anthocoris nemoralis* for apple and pear was tested in the laboratory. *Anthocoris nemorum* laid significantly more eggs on apple (75%) than on pear, while *A. nemoralis* preferred pear (71%). Over 90% of *A. nemorum* eggs were laid at the leaf margins whereas eggs of *A. nemoralis* were most commonly found in the leaf centre, 5 mm or more inside the leaf. Both laid more eggs on the ventral than on the dorsal side of pear leaves (*A. nemorum* 63%, *A. nemoralis* 94%), and in the last two experiments *A. nemorum* laid significantly more eggs on the dorsal side of apple leaves. The females' choice of oviposition site is important for the later distribution of immatures in host plants. The oviposition preferences found correspond to the natural distribution of these predators in apple and pear orchards. The preference of *A. nemorum* for the leaf margins, and of *A. nemoralis* for the leaf centre as oviposition site,

1 supports earlier observations. Anthocorids did not display a preference for the dorsal or  
2 ventral side of a leaf *per se*. Oviposition may be affected by the pubescence of the leaves.  
3 While the dorsal side of a pear leaf is quite smooth, the ventral side of an apple leaf  
4 present the most pubescent oviposition surface. Most eggs were found between these two  
5 extremes. Preference for cut leaves to whole leaves could help *A. nemorum* to locate prey  
6 in a field situation as also suggested by its preference to oviposit on leaves with eggs of  
7 *Operophtera brumata*.

## 9 **Introduction**

10  
11 Two of the most abundant predators in apple and pear orchards are *Anthocoris nemorum*  
12 (L.) and *Anthocoris nemoralis* (Fabricius) (Skanland, 1981; Solomon, 1982). Both have a  
13 wide range of hosts and habitats and oviposition occurs on various plants (Anderson,  
14 1962a; Collyer, 1967; Scutareanu et al., 1994). *Anthocoris nemoralis* is mostly found on  
15 perennials, *A. nemorum* is found on both perennials and annuals (Anderson, 1962a). They  
16 are probably strictly predatory bugs, though they can take up plant sap. However, to *A.*  
17 *nemorum* the value seems only equal to that of water (Lauenstein, 1980a). Both are  
18 polyphagous predators preying on aphids, mites, psyllids and lepidopteran eggs and  
19 young larvae, and are considered to play an important role in controlling insect pests  
20 (Collyer, 1953; Collyer 1967; Hill, 1957; Solomon, 1982), *Anthocoris nemoralis*  
21 particularly in controlling pear psyllids (Fauvel et al., 1984; Solomon et al., 1989;  
22 Trapman & Blommers, 1992; Rieux et al., 1994; Scutareanu et al., 1999; Beninato & la  
23 Morella, 2000; Solomon et al., 2000).

1 A predator's choice of oviposition site may be affected by various factors  
2 including the presence of prey, prey dietary quality, prey preferences, cues of prey on the  
3 host plant as well as the plant itself. Several studies have documented variable dietary  
4 quality of preys. Where psyllids were tested they ranked over aphids and other prey. All  
5 studies involving *A. nemorum* demonstrated marked differences among aphid species  
6 tested (Lauenstein, 1977). The quality of *Myzus persicae* and whiteflies were equal to *A.*  
7 *nemorum* (Ekbom, 1981). Both *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* were found to develop  
8 fastest and attain the highest adult weight when fed *Psylla mali* as compared to *Aphis*  
9 *fabae* and *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Anderson, 1962b). *Anthocoris nemoralis* nymphs were  
10 found to develop faster on eggs of pear psylla than on eggs of *Ephestia kuhniella* and  
11 *Ceratitis capitata* (Fauvel et al., 1984). Though clear differences can be found in dietary  
12 quality, earlier studies have not shown preference for any particular prey. Thus Ruth &  
13 Dwumfour (1989) found that *A. nemorum* readily accepted different aphid species.  
14 However, in a recent study comparing preference for aphids of importance in greenhouse  
15 production (Meyling et al., 2002) both *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* preferred *M.*  
16 *persicae* to *Macrosiphum euphorbiae*, *Aulacorthum solani* and *Aphis gossypii*. This result  
17 could have been affected by the fact that *M. persicae* nymphs were observed to be the  
18 least likely to move when attacked (Meyling et al., 2002). Earlier it was believed that  
19 anthocorids searched by tactile cues only (Lauenstein, 1980b). However, psylla infested  
20 pear trees have been shown to be attractive to anthocorids. Interestingly, laboratory  
21 reared *A. nemoralis* did not show such a preference before having experienced volatiles  
22 from damaged plants in the presence of food (Scutareanu et al., 1996; Drukker et al.,  
23 2000). Preferences for plants for oviposition have not been specifically tested, except for

1 a comparison of pear and barley leaves to *A. nemorum* (Herard & Chen, 1985). However  
2 several studies have documented the distribution of anthocorids among various habitats  
3 and annual changes in distribution among habitats (Anderson, 1962a; Collyer, 1967;  
4 Fauvel, 1999).

5 The present study tested whether the two anthocorids would have any oviposition  
6 preference for apple or pear, as choice of oviposition choice can greatly influence the  
7 resulting densities of their offspring on a given host.

## 9 **Materials and methods**

### 11 *Plant material*

12 To assess the choice of *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* between apple and pear leaves for  
13 oviposition, branches of pear (cv. Ovid) and apple (cv. Prima) were field collected  
14 immediately before the experiment at Rørrendegaard, an experimental orchard belonging  
15 to KVL. Branches were pruned to leave three fully developed healthy and undamaged  
16 leaves of 5-6 cm in length and 2-3 cm in width. Before being introduced to cages the  
17 pruned branches were gently shaken and thereafter carefully examined under  
18 stereomicroscope. Any remaining arthropods were removed with a fine paintbrush.

19 To assess oviposition choice in smaller cages between two single apples leaves  
20 either cut or undamaged, or with or without prey, branches were collected as described  
21 above, and individual healthy and undamaged leaves selected measuring 3-4 cm in length  
22 and 2-3 cm in width.

*Insects*        *Anthocoris nemorum* females were field collected in and around orchards and up till the onset of the experiment they were kept in thermo cabinets providing L16:D8 with day temperature of  $18 \pm 1$  °C and night temperature of  $12 \pm 1$  °C in individual cages ('medicine cups'). Cages measured 3.5 cm in diameter at the base, 4 cm in diameter at the top and 4 cm in height, and had lids with ventilation holes. Water was provided on a  $1 \times 1$  cm piece of gauze. A few *Anthocoris nemoralis* were field collected and tested in replicates one and two, the remaining were obtained from a laboratory rearing facility and then kept in the same way as *Anthocoris nemorum*. Excess of *Sitotroga cerealella* (Ol.) eggs were provided every second or third day until the onset of the experiment and at least for three days, to assure that all experimental animals were well fed. Eggs of *Operophtera brumata* L. were obtained from females collected on oak (*Quercus robur*) kindly provided by Dr. Vanbergen, CEC Banchory. Ten eggs were applied to each treated leaf with a wet paintbrush. Leaves were allowed to dry before use.

*Cages*        Cages for comparing the oviposition on apple and pear were transparent plastic jars, 7 cm in diameter and 9 cm high. They were used upside-down. One branch of apple and one of pear were mounted in two individual, opposite holes equidistant from the centre and cage sides. Water was provided on a square piece of gauze on the cage floor between the branches. The ends of the branches reached down in a beaker with water. Each cage had a ventilation hole of 2 cm in diameter at the top. The ventilation hole was covered with filter paper.

The small cages used for individual rearing of anthocorids, as described above, were used to compare oviposition on single leaves either a whole or a wounded leaf, or a

1 leaf with prey or one without prey. To provide water and support for the leaves the base  
2 of the cages were covered with 3% agar, into which the petiole could conveniently be  
3 stuck. For the comparison of oviposition on a whole or wounded leaf one leaf was  
4 inserted whole, and one leaf had approximately one quarter removed from the apical end  
5 with a scalpel immediately prior to the onset of the experiment. Leaves were so chosen  
6 that sizes of the two leaves were equivalent after the wounding of one leaf.

7  
8 *Method* Three experiments tested the oviposition of *A. nemorum* given the choice  
9 of apple and pear. A fourth experiment with the same set-up included both *A. nemorum*  
10 and *A. nemoralis*. A few field collected *A. nemoralis* females were tested along the *A.*  
11 *nemorum* in the first and second experiments thus allowing a first comparison of  
12 responses with those of mass-reared *A. nemoralis*. All experiments were done between  
13 mid May and mid June (13 May, 21 May, 29 May and 23 June 2001) thus including a  
14 mixture of over wintering females and the first spring generation.

15 In small cages the effect of a healthy or a freshly wounded leaf on oviposition was  
16 compared. This experiment was replicated twice including both *A. nemorum* and *A.*  
17 *nemoralis* first both with leaves of apple or leaves of pear (26 June 2001, on apple *A.*  
18 *nemorum* n = 9, *A. nemoralis* n = 9 and on pear n = 8 and 10, respectively) second only  
19 with apple leaves (13 July 2001, *A. nemorum* n = 28, *A. nemoralis* n = 18). Finally an  
20 experiment assessed oviposition preference of *A. nemorum* for apple leaves with no prey  
21 and apple leaves with *Operopthera brumata* eggs (8 August, n = 20).

22 At the onset of an experiment one anthocorid female was carefully introduced into  
23 each cage, in the larger cages through the ventilation hole. Each experiment lasted 48 h,

with L:D of 16:8 and temperature of  $25 \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Humidity within the cages was (mean  $\pm$  s.d.)  $89 \pm 3\%$  rh, ranging from 84-93% rh, enough to maintain the freshness of the plant material.

After removal of the anthocorids from the cages, plant material was examined for eggs under the stereomicroscope. For each egg, the eggs position was noted as leaf margin ( $< 5$  mm from edge), leaf centre ( $> 5$  mm from edge), leaf tip ( $< 5$  mm from the tip), or petiole. For eggs laid on the leaf it was also noted whether they were laid on the dorsal or ventral side of the leaf. Finally eggs closer to each other than 5 mm were also recorded as a batch.

*Data analysis* All statistical analysis was carried out in SAS/STAT ver. 6.12 (SAS Institute 1990). Preferences within a species were analysed with a paired t-test (PROC MEANS on the difference between a pair of observations). Across species analyses were made using PROC MIXED with anthocorid individuals as a random effect for experiment four and for the experiment comparing preference for cut and uncut leaves. Replicates in which anthocorids did not lay any eggs during the 48 hours each experiment lasted were excluded from analyses.

## Results

*Oviposition on apple or pear* The number of eggs laid by a female within or across experiments was not significantly different between *A. nemorum* (mean  $\pm$  s.e. =  $10.3 \pm 0.8$ ,  $n = 64$ ) and *A. nemoralis* ( $8.1 \pm 1.3$ ,  $n = 26$ ), nor between field collected and



1 mass-reared *A. nemoralis* ( $8.5 \pm 3.0$ ,  $n = 8$  and  $7.9 \pm 1.4$ ,  $n = 18$ , respectively). Both  
2 species laid fewer eggs in experiment one (*A. nemorum*  $7.5 \pm 1.4$ ,  $n = 16$  and *A.*  
3 *nemoralis*  $2.3 \pm 1.9$ ,  $n = 5$ ). A total of six *A. nemorum* and five *A. nemoralis* laid no eggs  
4 and were excluded from the later analysis. Of these, three of each species were from  
5 experiment one, partly explaining the lower average number of eggs in this experiment.  
6 The remaining number of replicates in the experiments comparing oviposition on apple  
7 and pear were for *A. nemorum*: exp 1:  $n=13$ , exp 2:  $n = 14$ , exp 3:  $n= 13$ , exp 4:  $n= 18$ ,  
8 and for *A. nemoralis*: exp 1:  $n = 2$ , exp 2:  $n= 4$ , exp 4:  $n = 16$ .

9 Both species often laid more eggs together (less than 5 mm apart) resulting in an  
10 average batch size of  $1.5 \pm 0.1$  for *A. nemorum* and  $1.6 \pm 0.1$  for *A. nemoralis* ( $p$ : n.s.,  
11 both range: 1-4 eggs).

12 A clear difference in choice of plant for oviposition could be seen. *Anthocoris*  
13 *nemorum* laid 75% of its eggs on apple (exp 1,  $T = 3.1$ ,  $P < 0.007$ , exp 2,  $T = 2.6$ ,  $P <$   
14  $0.02$ , exp 3,  $T = 4.3$   $P < 0.0004$ , exp 4:  $T = 5.9$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) and *A. nemoralis* 72% of its  
15 eggs on pear (exp 1,  $T = -0.7$ ,  $P = 0.54$ , exp 2,  $T = -5.1$ ,  $P < 0.02$ , exp 4,  $T = -2.6$ ,  $P <$   
16  $0.02$ ) (Figure 1). In experiment four, where both anthocorid species were represented in  
17 almost equal numbers there was a significant effect of plant ( $F = 4.4$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.04$ )  
18 and the crossed effect of anthocorid species by plant on the number of eggs laid on either  
19 plant was highly significant ( $F = 37.2$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) ( $n = 68$ ).

20 Eggs of *A. nemorum* were predominantly found inserted in the leaf margins  
21 including the leaf tip on both apple and pear. Since there was no significant difference  
22 among experiments for pear, or for *A. nemoralis* on apple, these data were pooled for the  
23 T-test. Across experiments 93% of *A. nemorum* eggs were laid in leaf margins on apple.

1 Though there was a significant preference for leaf margin in all four experiments data for  
2 *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled (exp 1,  $T = 7.6$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ , exp 2,  $T = 2.9$ ,  $P <$   
3  $0.02$ , exp 3,  $T = 7.5$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ , exp 4,  $T = 6.2$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). Similarly *A. nemorum* laid  
4 95% of its eggs in the leaf margin of pear ( $T = 6.0$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). Eggs of *A. nemoralis*  
5 were most commonly found in the leaf centre (5 mm or more from leaf margins) with  
6 81% on apple ( $T = -2.8$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) and 67% on pear, though only near significant on pear  
7 ( $T = -0.9$ ,  $P = 0.07$ ) (Figure 2). There was a highly significant effect of anthocorid species  
8 on the difference between numbers laid in margin and leaf centre in experiment four ( $F =$   
9  $22.5$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), a significant effect of plant ( $F = 9.9$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.003$ ) and the  
10 crossed effect of anthocorid species by plant was highly significant ( $F = 19.1$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P <$   
11  $0.0001$ ) ( $n = 68$ ), indicating that the level of preference for leaf margin and leaf centre  
12 depends on the interaction of the two factors.

13 *Anthocoris nemorum* laid 63% of its eggs on the ventral side of pear leaves ( $T = -$   
14  $2.0$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and *A. nemoralis* 83% ( $T = -3.7$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Since there was no significant  
15 difference among experiments for pear or for *A. nemoralis* on apple, data were pooled for  
16 the T-test. On apple *Anthocoris nemoralis* laid few eggs. Of these 52% were laid on the  
17 dorsal leaf side, showing no significant preference for leaf side in *A. nemoralis* on apple.  
18 Data for choice of leaf side by *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled. It laid  
19 significantly more eggs on the upper leaf side in experiments three and four ( $T = 3.1$ ,  $P <$   
20  $0.008$  and  $T = 2.5$ ,  $P < 0.02$ ), but in experiments one and two no significant preference  
21 was found (Figure 3). Experiment four revealed a highly significant effect of plant ( $F =$   
22  $25.5$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), and a significant effect of species ( $F = 14.8$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0003$ )  
23 ( $n = 68$ ), but no significant crossed effect on the difference between numbers of eggs laid

on the dorsal and ventral leaf sides, indicating that the choice of leaf side for oviposition on apple and pear does not interact with anthocorid species.

*Oviposition preference assessed in small cages* As data for the two experiments with cut versus uncut leaves were not significantly different they were pooled for statistical analysis. *Anthocoris nemorum* laid 63% of its eggs on cut apple leaves ( $T = 2.0$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ,  $n = 24$ ), while the opposite was true for *A. nemoralis* which laid only 37% of its eggs on the cut apple leaves ( $T = -2.1$ ,  $P < 0.04$ ,  $n = 20$ ). Few females laid eggs on pear leaves. While *A. nemoralis* also preferred uncut pear leaves ( $T = -2.87$ ,  $P < 0.04$ ,  $n = 5$ ), preference for cut leaves was not significant for the few replicates with *A. nemorum* on pear ( $T = 2.31$ ,  $P = 0.15$ ,  $n = 3$ ) (Figure 4). There was a significant crossed effect of anthocorid species by plant on the difference in eggs laid on cut and uncut leaves ( $F = 12.27$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $n = 52$ ) and no significant main effects of anthocorid species or plant.

There was a near-significant preference of *A. nemorum* for oviposition on apple leaves with *O. brumata* eggs over clean leaves (mean with eggs  $\pm$  s.e. =  $5.1 \pm 1.3$ , mean without eggs =  $3.1 \pm 0.5$ ,  $T = -2.2$ ,  $P = 0.057$ ,  $n = 10$ ).

## Discussion

The present study demonstrated a clear preference for oviposition host plant for both anthocorid species and a highly significant difference between their host plant choices. Since the ability of moving to alternative plants is very limited for the wingless young,

1 oviposition preference will greatly affect the resulting density of immatures on a given  
2 plant and thus the potential role of these predators in apple and pear orchards. Oviposition  
3 preference may be a major explanation why *A. nemorum* is more abundant in apple and  
4 *A. nemoralis* in pear (Skanland ,1981; Herard & Chen, 1985).

5 One other study assessed oviposition preference of *A. nemorum*: Herard & Chen  
6 (1985) found that young barley leaves were preferred over young pear leaves, except  
7 when prey (*C. pyri*) was offered on pear but not on barley. Batch size in this study was  
8 less for *A. nemorum* than the two to eight eggs mentioned by Sands (1957), who also  
9 noted that eggs of *A. nemoralis* were seldom laid in batches.

10 The observed preference of leaf margins of *A. nemorum* in contrast to *A.*  
11 *nemoralis* (Figure 2) corresponds to earlier records of their general oviposition pattern on  
12 different host plants (Hodgson & Aveling, 1988) and are in agreement with results from  
13 Elliott & Way (1968) who found that 95% of *A. nemorum* eggs were laid on the leaf  
14 margin (2mm from edge) (48.6%) or stipules (47.4%) of bean (*Vicia faba*). Search for  
15 prey by *A. nemorum* is also concentrated on leaf margins as found on *Brassica oleracea*  
16 *var. gongylodes* (90.4%), tobacco (67.3%) and bean *Phaceolus vulgaris* (65.1%)  
17 (Lauenstein, 1980b). On the contrary, *A. nemoralis* spend more time searching on the leaf  
18 centre. Thus Brunner & Burts (1975) observed that it searched the leaf midrib half its  
19 time and spent 71% of its time on the ventral side of pear leaves. Thus, the search pattern  
20 of *A. nemoralis* also seems to reflect its oviposition pattern. Overlap of oviposition and  
21 search for prey at the single leaf scale may present a potential risk of egg cannibalism at  
22 high predator densities. On a whole tree, however, oviposition sites and search for prey  
23 may be spatially separated.

1        No overall preference for dorsal or ventral leaf side *per se* was found but both  
2 species laid most eggs on the dorsal side of apple leaves and the ventral side of pear  
3 leaves, and in the two last experiments *A. nemorum* showed a significant preference for  
4 the dorsal side of apple leaves. While the ventral side of apple leaves is very hairy, and  
5 the dorsal side of pear leaves almost hairless, the dorsal side of apple leaves and the  
6 ventral side of pear leaves are intermediate in this respect. Thus it is possible that choice  
7 of oviposition site is affected by leaf surface structure. Possibly the difference between  
8 leaves sides on apple were more pronounced to anthocorids in the last two experiments,  
9 when leaves would tend to be slightly older. Warabieda et al. (1997) suggest that  
10 pubescence may protect spider mites (*Tetranychus urticae*) from predation. Possibly  
11 anthocorid females can protect their eggs by choosing oviposition sites with some  
12 pubescence, but on the other hand may prefer to search more smooth areas. Thus,  
13 according to Lauenstein (1980b), *A. nemorum* searched upper surfaces of leaves more  
14 thoroughly than under surfaces, most so on the smooth brassica, intermediate on tobacco,  
15 least so on bean.

16        The preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* to oviposit on cut apple leaves over whole  
17 leaves may be influenced by volatiles from the newly cut leaves. Such a preference could  
18 help *A. nemorum* to locate prey in the field. The fact that *A. nemoralis* preferred whole  
19 leaves to leaves with this particular damage may be that as this species mostly oviposits  
20 away from leaf margins it was in less direct contact with any leaf exudates from the cut  
21 leaf, and perhaps experienced a change in leaf quality as oviposition medium. Prey search  
22 of another anthocorids, *Orius tristicolor*, has earlier been found to increase when leaves  
23 were artificially damaged with a pin. Thus, bean leaves that prior to experiments had

1 been exposed to plant feeding (thrips or spider mites) or artificial damage elicited  
2 increased searching, and resulting higher predation success (VanLaerhoven et al., 2000).  
3 Maybe the preference of *A. nemoralis*, which mostly preys upon psyllids and other  
4 insects which pierce, rather than chew, plant material, would have been different towards  
5 pierced rather than cut leaves.

6 Field collected leaves where preys are mechanically removed, as used in this  
7 study, may still hold volatiles related to preys or their feeding. The most common prey  
8 observed on collected leaves was *Psylla mali* on apple and a few aphids and psyllids on  
9 both apple and pear. From Dutch studies the attraction of *A. nemoralis* to volatiles from  
10 pear psylla-infested trees is well documented (Scutareanu et al., 1997; Drukker et al.,  
11 2000). This study suggests that *A. nemorum* prefer to oviposits near prey. Likewise,  
12 (Steer, 1929) observed that *A. nemorum* preferred to oviposit near spider mite colonies.

13 *Anthocoris nemoralis* is currently under evaluation for inoculative and/or  
14 inundative releases against pear psylla in various European countries, so far with variable  
15 results, often with initial success followed by dispersal away from the release area  
16 (Fauvel et al., 1984; Rieux et al., 1994; Beninato et al., 2000). Oviposition preference,  
17 presence of prey and/or plant related volatiles, may all affect the attraction to a plant,  
18 oviposition and later the retention of adult *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* in orchards and  
19 thus the success of biological control.

## 20 21 **Acknowledgements**

22 Thanks to M. Solomon, O. P. Tikkanen, N. Meyling and P. Esbjerg for valuable  
23 discussions. I am grateful to A. Vanbergen for supplying *O. brumata* eggs. Thanks to Bo

1 Martin Bibby for statistical advice. Special thanks to P. Esbjerg for commenting on a  
2 draft of this paper.

3  
4 **References**

5  
6 Anderson, N. H., 1962a. Bionomics of six species of *Anthocoris* (Heteroptera:  
7 Anthocoridae) in England. Transactions of the Entomological Society of London 114:  
8 67-95.

9 Anderson, N. H., 1962b. Growth and fecundity of *Anthocoris* spp. reared on various prey  
10 (Hetroptera: Anthocoridae). Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 5: 40-52.

11 Beninato, S., & S. la Morella, 2000. Control of *Cacopsylla pyri* with massive releases of  
12 *Anthocoris nemoralis* in pear orchards. Giornate Fitopatologiche, Perugia, 16-20 aprile,  
13 2000, 1: 367-372.

14 Brunner, J. F.& E. C. Burts, 1975. Searching behavior and growth rates of *Anthocoris*  
15 *nemoralis* (Hemiptera: Anthocoridae), a predator of the pear psylla, *Psylla pyricola*.  
16 Annals of the Entomological Society of America 68: 311-315.

17 Collyer, E., 1953. Biology of some predatory insects and mites associated with the fruit  
18 tree red spider mite *Metatransychus ulmi* (Koch) in South-Eastern England. II Some  
19 important predators of the mite. Journal of Horticultural Science 28: 85-97.

20 Collyer, E., 1967. On the Ecology of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) (Hemiptera-Heteroptera).  
21 Proceedings of the Entomological Society of London 42: 107-118.

- 1 Drukker, B., J. Bruin, & M. W. Sabelis, 2000. Anthocorid predators learn to associate  
2 herbivore-induced plant volatiles with presence or absence of prey. Physiological  
3 Entomology 25: 260-265.
- 4 Ekbom, B. S., 1981. Efficiency of the predator *Anthocoris nemorum* (Het.: Anthocoridae)  
5 against the greenhouse whitefly, *Trialeurodes vaporariorum* (Hom.: Aleyrodidae).  
6 Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Entomologie 92: 26-34.
- 7 Elliott, W. M. & M. J. Way, 1968. The action of some systemic insecticides on the eggs  
8 of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) and *A. confusus* Reut. Annals of Applied Biology 62: 215-  
9 226.
- 10 Fauvel, G., 1999. Diversity of Heteroptera in agroecosystems: role of sustainability and  
11 bioindication. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 74: 275-303.
- 12 Fauvel, G., M. Thiry. & D. Cotton, 1984. Progress towards the artificial rearing of  
13 *Anthocoris nemoralis* F. Bulletin SROP 7: 176-183.
- 14 Herard, F. & K. Chen, 1985. Ecology of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) (Heteroptera:  
15 Anthocoridae) and evaluation of its potential effectiveness for biological control of pear  
16 psylla. Agronomie 5: 855-863.
- 17 Hill, A.R., 1957. The biology of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) in Scotland (Hemiptera:  
18 Anthocoridae). Transactions of the Entomological Society of London 109: 379-394.



- 1 Hodgson, C. & C. Aveling, 1988. Anthocoridae. In: A. K. Minks & P. Harrewijn (eds),  
2 Aphids, Their Biology, Natural Enemies and Control, vol 2B, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp.  
3 279-292.
- 4 Lauenstein, G., 1977. Investigations on the fertility and oviposition of the predacious bug  
5 *Anthocoris nemorum* L. (Hem.: Heteroptera). Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Entomologie  
6 83: 355-363.
- 7 Lauenstein, G., 1980a. On the uptake of plant substances by the predacious bug  
8 *Anthocoris nemorum* (Hem.: Heteroptera). Entomophaga 24: 431-441.
- 9 Lauenstein, G., 1980b. The searching behaviour of *Anthocoris nemorum* L. (Het.  
10 Anthocoridae). Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Entomologie 89: 428-442.
- 11 Meyling, N. V., A. Enkegaard & H. Brødsgaard, 2002. The flower bugs, *Anthocoris*  
12 *nemorum* and *Anthocoris nemoralis*, voracity and prey preference for aphids in  
13 glasshouses. IOBC/ wprs Bulletin 25: 185-188.
- 14 Rieux, R., G. Fauvel, A. d'Faivre, G. Fournage & A. Lyoussoffi, 1994. Study of  
15 biological control against *Cacopsylla pyri* (L.) in pear orchards by experimental release  
16 of *Anthocoris nemoralis* F. in the egg stage. II. - results and discussion. Bulletin OILB  
17 SROP 17: 120-124.
- 18 Ruth, J. & E. F. Dwumfour, 1989. Laboratory studies on the suitability of some aphid  
19 species for food of the predaceous flower bug *Anthocoris gallarum ulmi* (DeG.)  
20 (Heteroptera, Anthocoridae). Journal of Applied Entomology 108: 321-327.

- 1 Sands, W.A., 1957. The immature stages of some British Anthocoridae (Hemiptera).
- 2 Transactions of the Entomological Society of London 109: 295-310.
- 3 SAS Institute 1990. SAS/STAT User's Guide Version 6. SAS/STAT Inc., Cary N. C.
- 4 Scutareanu, P., B. Drukker, J. Bruin, M. A. Posthumus & M. W. Sabelis, 1996. Leaf
- 5 volatiles and polyphenols in pear trees infested by *Psylla pyricola*. Evidence of
- 6 simultaneously induced responses. Chemoecology 7: 34-38.
- 7 Scutareanu, P., B. Drukker, J. Bruin, M. A. Posthumus & M. W. Sabelis, 1997. Volatiles
- 8 from Psylla-infested pear trees and their possible involvement in attraction of anthocorid
- 9 predators. Journal of Chemical Ecology 23: 2241-2260.
- 10 Scutareanu, P., B. Drukker & M. W. Sabelis, 1994. Local population dynamics of pear
- 11 psyllids and their anthocorid predators. Bulletin OILB SROP 17: 18-22.
- 12 Scutareanu, P., R. Lingeman, B. Drukker, & M. W. Sabelis, 1999. Cross-correlation
- 13 analysis of fluctuations in local populations of pear psyllids and anthocorid bugs.
- 14 Ecological Entomology 24: 354-362.
- 15 Skanland, H. T., 1981. Studies on the arthropod fauna of a Norwegian apple orchard.
- 16 Fauna Norvegica B 28: 25-34.
- 17 Solomon, M. G. 1982. Phytophagous mites and their predators in apple orchards. Annals
- 18 of Applied Biology 101: 201-203.

- 1 Solomon, M. G., J. E. Cranham, M. A. Easterbrook & J. D. Fitzgerald, 1989. Control of  
2 the pear psyllid, *Cacopsylla pyricola*, in South East England by predators and pesticides.  
3 Crop Protection 8: 197-205.
- 4 Solomon, M. G., J. V. Cross, J. D. Fitzgerald, C. A. M. Campbell, R. L. Jolly, R. W.  
5 Olszak, E. Niemczyk & H. Vogt, 2000. Biocontrol of pests of apples and pears in  
6 northern and central Europe - 3. Predators. Biocontrol Science and Technology 10: 91-  
7 128.
- 8 Steer, W. 1929. Notes on *Anthocoris nemorum* L. (Hemiptera-Anthocoridae). The  
9 Entomologists Monthly Magazine 65: 103-104.
- 10 Trapman, M. & L. Blommers, 1992. An attempt to pear sucker management in the  
11 Netherlands. Journal of Applied Entomology 114: 38-51.
- 12 VanLaerhoven, S., D. R. Gillespie, & R. R. McGregor, 2000. Leaf damage and prey type  
13 determine search effort in *Orius tristicolor*. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 97:  
14 167-174.
- 15 Warabieda, W., R. W. Olszak, & B. Dyki, 1997. Morphological and anatomical  
16 characters of apple leaves associated with cultivar susceptibility to spider mite  
17 infestation. Acta Agrobotanica 50: 53-64.

1 Figure 1. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* (exp 1: n =13, exp 2: n = 14,  
2 exp 3: n= 13, exp 4: n= 18) and *A. nemoralis* (exp 1: n = 2, exp 2: n= 4, exp 4: n = 16) for  
3 apple or pear (mean number of eggs + s.e.).

4

5 Figure 2. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* (n = 58) and *A. nemoralis* (n =  
6 22) for leaf margin or leaf of apple and pear leaves (mean number of eggs + s.e.). Data  
7 for *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled and are presented for the individual  
8 experiments (exp 1: n =13, exp 2: n = 14, exp 3: n= 13, exp 4: n= 18). Remaining results  
9 were pooled and are presented across experiments.

10

11 Figure 3. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* (n = 58) and *A. nemoralis* (n =  
12 22) for dorsal or ventral leaf side of apple and pear leaves (mean number of eggs + s.e.).  
13 Data for *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled and are presented for the individual  
14 experiments (exp 1: n =13, exp 2: n = 14, exp 3: n= 13, exp 4: n= 18). Remaining results  
15 were pooled and are presented across experiments.

16

17 Figure 4. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* for cut or  
18 uncut leaves of apple (*A. nemorum*, n = 24, *A. nemoralis*, n = 20) or pear (*A. nemorum*, n  
19 = 3, *A. nemoralis*, n = 5) (mean number of eggs + s.e.).

20

21

22

23







